



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/681,219

10/09/2003

Jung-Soo Suh

Q76722

8338

23373 7590 10/15/2007  
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.  
SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

SHIH, HAOSHIAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2173

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/15/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/681,219

**Applicant(s)**

SUH, JUNG-SOO

**Examiner**

Haoshian Shih

**Art Unit**

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-15 are pending in this application and have been examined in response to application RCE filed on 09/20/2007.
2. Claims 9-15 are new.

### ***Specification***

3. The amendment filed 09/20/2007 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: the limitation "ignored" or "ignoring" mentioned in claims 1-2, 9 and 12 are not described in the original specification.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 2173

5. Claims 1-2, 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

6. Claims 1-2, 9 and 12 recites the limitation "ignored" or "ignoring". There is no mention in the original specification of having such word. Thus, the limitation includes subject matter that was not described in the original specification.

If the examiner has overlooked the portion of the original specification that describes the feature of the present invention, then applicant should point it out (by page number and line number) in the response to this office action.

Applicant may obviate this rejection by canceling the claim.

7. Claim 3 recites the limitation "display device is **not** a mode for displaying the video signal generated by the host device, **executing** the input". It is not clear how the input signal can be both ignored as described in claim 2 and executed as described in claim 3 when the display device is not a mode for displaying the video signal generated by the host device.

Applicant may remove the phrase "not" for claim 3 to make sense.

8. Claim 13 recites the limitation "the current mode indicator". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

- 10. Claims 1-5 and 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Greer et al. (Greer, US 6,993,722 B1).**

11. As to **INDEPENDENT** claim 1, Greer discloses a method of controlling input in a host device capable of generating video signals and having a main unit and an input unit, the host device capable of being connected to a display device, the method comprising:

(a) sensing input via the input unit (col.4, lines 35-38; "remote control" issues commands to drive the multifunctional product);

(b) determining output mode of the display device by communicating with the display device (col.3, lines 51-58; output mode is determined to produce best displaying

result), the output mode being selected by the user for displaying one of an outside signal among a plurality of outside signals received by the display device (fig.6, "200"; col.4, lines 8-18; a context manager allows a user to select between different output modes); and

(c) processing the input by the main unit according to the output mode after sensing the input from the input unit (col.4, lines 39-45; the key input unit (fig.6 "remote control");

wherein the input from the input unit is one of ignored and executed in accordance with the output mode of the display device (fig.1d, "32", fig.1e, "42", fig.1g, "62"; col.11, lines 65 – col.12, lines 15; col.7, lines 30-34; The input operation is halted, paused, stopped or disconnected from the pervious main device when the output mode is of the current main device. **Further, the phrase "ignored" is not indicated in the spec, phrases such as "block", "cancel" and "invalidate" are used in the spec and are substantially similar to "halted", "paused", "stopped" or "disconnected").**

12. As to claim 2, Greer discloses if the output mode of the displaying device is not a mode for displaying the video signal generated by the host device, ignoring the input (fig.2b and fig 6 both illustrated controls for mode switching; col.7, lines 30-34; The input operation is halted, paused, stopped or disconnected from the pervious main device when the output mode is of the current main device. **Further, the phrase "ignoring" is not indicated in the spec, phrases such as "block", "cancel" and "invalidate"**

Art Unit: 2173

**are used in the spec and are substantially similar to “halted”, “paused”, “stopped” or “disconnected”).**

13. As to claim 3, Greer discloses if the output mode of the displaying device is not a mode for displaying the video signal generated by the host device, executing the input (when the output mode is a PC mode (fig.1g, “60”), other modes (fig.1g “62”) are suspended, and the input commands from the PC are properly executed (fig.1g, “63”).

14. As to claim 4, Greer discloses wherein the host device is a PC (fig.2A, “set-top box”).

15. As to claim 5, Greer discloses wherein communication between the display device and the main unit is performed by at least one of a serial and parallel communication (col.10, lines 46; “universal serial bus for communicating”).

16. As to claim 7, Greer discloses wherein the input unit is a keyboard (fig.6, a remote keyboard is indicated).

17. As to claim 8, Greer discloses wherein the input unit is a mouse (fig.6, “201”, mouse).

Art Unit: 2173

18. As to **INDEPENDENT** claim 9, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 1 above.

19. As to claim 10, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 7 above.

20. As to claim 11, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 8 above.

21. As to **INDEPENDENT** claim 12, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 1 above.

22. As to claim 13, Greer discloses displaying the current mode indicator according to the output mode of the display device (col.10, lines 9-10).

23. As to claim 14, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 5 above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

24. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.



Art Unit: 2173

**25. Claim 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greer and Lambrecht et al. (Lambrecht, US 5,754,801).**

26. As to claim 6, Greer discloses the serial communication between the monitor and the computer main unit (fig.2a, "BUS 95"; lines 44-53). Greer does not specifically disclose the communication is performed by an I2C bus/protocol system.

In the same field of endeavor, Lambrecht discloses a serial communication performed by an I2C bus (col.13, lines 34-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Greer and Lambrecht before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the communication bus taught by Greer to include an I2C bus taught by Lambrecht with the motivation being to provide more communication interface options for the user.

27. As to claim 15, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 6 above.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 09/20/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2173

Applicant argues that Greer does not disclose the input from the input unit is either ignored or executed in accordance with the output mode of the display device, that stop/halt/disconnection are not equivalent to ignore.

In response to applicant's argument, Greer discloses in fig.2b and fig 6 both illustrated controls for mode switching; col.7, lines 30-34; The input operation is halted, paused, stopped or disconnected from the pervious main device when the output mode is of the current main device. Further, the phrase "ignoring" is not indicated in the spec, phrases such as "block", "cancel" and "invalidate" are used in the spec in lieu of the phrase "ignore" and are substantially similar to "halted", "paused", "stopped" or "disconnected".

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haoshian Shih whose telephone number is (571) 270-1257. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 0730-1700.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2173

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HSS

  
TADESSE HAILU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER